GENEVA *versus* PEACE

By

COMTE DE SAINT-AULAIRE

Ambassador of France to Great Britain (1920–24)

TRANSLATED BY

FRANCIS JACKSON

NEW YORK
SHEED & WARD
1937

MA

CHAPTER III

THE REAL FORCES AT WORK

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE CHURCH

"ONE cannot even compare the League of Nations to the language of Esop," said *Le Matin* of April 18th, 1936, "because in the language of Esop there was good and bad, whilst in the League of Nations there is only bad. The League has not improved upon the methods of the old diplomacy, but it has added to them verbiage, humbug, trickery and the washing of dirty linen in public. It has not diminished the number of international differences, but has aggravated the importance of them, bringing into play solidarities which complicate everything and prevent nothing. It is not a conservatorium of peace but a game of grab. It is not a garden but a wilderness."

The above quotation is consoling. For too long the League of Nations had disarmed criticism. The justice meted out to it to-day by a great newspaper announces the revenge of common sense and truth. Heaven send that this revenge be prompt enough and complete enough to ward off the revenge of Germany on which the League lavishes its care, without, however, neglecting to fan the embers on other hearths! At whatever point the conflagration may break out, it is to the League that we shall owe its origin. By its insistence on disarming the peaceful and favouring the rearming of the warlike, the League has produced

on the one side a depression and on the other side a high pressure which give rise to storms so violent that it is impossible to limit the scourge. For this reason the next war, even if it is not directly provoked at Geneva, as the crusade for the Negus would have been, will be the war of the League of Nations.

If the great public begins to get understanding, perhaps we shall soon see freemasonry abandoning so compromising a daughter, lest it should itself be abandoned by its own clients. We hope that those Catholics who are still partisans of the League, in spite of its origin, will not wait for the example of the masonic lodges to recognize their error.

I have heard an eminent ecclesiastic express the same wish in these terms: "Faith, prudence and discipline agree in forbidding us all compromise with the League of Nations: faith, because there is a contradiction between our creed and an institution which sets itself up to be a new religion, a religion which is really the opium of the nations, although it was founded by those who denounce Catholicism as the opium of the people; a religion which claims to substitute itself, if not for God, at any rate for Providence; a religion which, if it recruited its missionaries from amongst us, would soon light in France, following the example of the Russian and Spanish revolutions, a diabolical spiritual hearth; a religion which by the voice of freemasonry announces (to adopt the expression of M. Jean Guiraud in *La Croix*) the disappearance of all fatherlands in the great whole; then will humanity adore itself."

The contradiction which exists between the basic laws of the institutions is not less irreconcilable than that between their doctrines. The Church of Rome is an absolute monarchy; the Church of Geneva, in

theory a democratic republic, is in fact a masked oligarchy. Between the two there is nothing in common but the word "peace." But in Rome the word is a truth; to the Father of the faithful the brotherhood of men and nations is not an empty formula. At Geneva, however, the word is a lie, a veil under the shelter of which national egoisms, insatiable imperialisms and subversive internationals conspire against peace. It is on this ground that human wisdom and prudence meet and are in accord with the divine wisdom to drive us away from Geneva. The French clergy must not forget the campaign, evidently of masonic origin, organized in August, 1914, to thrust the responsibility for the catastrophe upon them. This infamous rumour pointed an accusing finger at the clergy as the ally of the enemy. Do you believe that the memory of their heroes would warn the clergy against a recurrence of the same calumny, especially if there were any foundation for it in the indiscretions of some of their members? In the event of such a second attack upon the clergy the "infamous rumour" would become more specific and wider in its scope and would exploit in a generalization, more cowardly than courageous, the pacifism of a noisy minority to dedicate to public vengeance and punishment all French priests, by denouncing them as the agents of a foreign sovereign. The government of the Republic—or freemasonry, for it is the same thing—is an adept in this manœuvre which it made use of in 1914 following the example of 1792 and 1871. In 19— the accusation would be much more dangerous, because less unlikely, if those amongst us who have been deceived, persevere in their error in spite of the blunt contradiction of events. Must we wait until this contradiction is stained with blood? Then it

would be too late. The criminals who through their fanaticism, or their unscrupulous ambition to achieve political success, expose us to the risk of war would then succeed in turning upon the priests the anger of the people. The Church of France has better things to do than to provide them with a scapegoat.

The Church of Italy shows the way to the Church of France. Its prelates brought into the Italian treasury the gold from their pastoral crosses and supported the high morale of the nation by the pen and the spoken word. This attitude which did not suggest any zeal for the League, the ally of Ethiopia, has never been censured by the Holy See. On the contrary, His Holiness, Pius XI., formally condemned bolshevism which is the other ally of Geneva. Is there not in that condemnation a tacit and a stronger condemnation *a fortiori* of that institution which is the home of all the abettors of war and revolution? The sacrilegious theologians of the League would say that the League of Nations is a pure entity and that it has an existence in itself, *in se*. They would say that the evils which spring from it are but fortuitous, or, at the most, distinct entities. But the time is past when some can profit by evasion and the others are victims of anxiety; ever since, by a unanimous movement, the Church of France gave its adherence to the stirring words uttered in its name a few months ago to the Ambassadors of France in a great hall in Paris. It was then that we saw advancing with a cortege of prelates, a prince of the Church who wore upon his breast the cross, the symbol of divine love. We heard him speaking, to an immense crowd, words which passed beyond that crowd to the ears of all Christendom, an ardent Christmas message which finds an echo in the canticles of the angels in heaven, Peace to men of good will. What is the meaning of

this message? What is the name of that new star which shines tremblingly in the night to guide the great human family towards a better future? " It is," said His Eminence Cardinal Verdier, " the International of Love through the communion of souls. This star is at the Antipodes of Geneva—a land without a heaven except for the clouds that obscure it—which by its tenacity in provoking a frightful carnage amongst Christian peoples, in order to satiate the spite of freemasonry against Mussolini, is the International of Hate."

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND ISRAEL

I do not wish to draw down upon my devoted head the thunders of that eminent ecclesiastic by undertaking the defence of freemasonry. It would be a bad cause. The accused has confessed, or rather has been betrayed by one of the governments which received the project of 1917, a project not purely academic since the Covenant of the League was a faithful reproduction of its spirit, especially in its application. Let us read, for example, art. 4 of the project: " A people which is not free, that is to say, which does not possess democratic and liberal institutions indispensable to its development *cannot constitute a nation.*"

When it is taken literally this text allows an exclusion which is not consistent with the claim to universality, especially since " democratic and liberal institutions " have suffered so many damaging attacks. The first article of the Covenant restricts itself to saying that " every state which is freely governed " can become a member of the League. In law this formula is the wider, although liable to the most arbitrary interpretations. In fact a mental restriction derives from it the same excommunications as from the masonic text.

Liberty at Geneva and in the masonic lodge has the same meaning: " Every licence for us and our friends and no right for the others." The Soviets who possess " democratic institutions " are above the laws and participate in the right divine of Revolution. Hence came the violation of all international engagements and offensive wars against Poland and Persia. Hence came the massacre and martyrdom of a whole people, the people of Georgia. These are pious works! Abyssinia is the worst and cruellest slave-dealing country in the whole world, but the choice of a man from the left wing, M. Jèze, to represent Abyssinia at the League of Nations attests a praiseworthy effort to develop in the direction of liberal institutions. Moreover, the enemy of our enemy is our friend. Hurrah for the Negus! And let the hue and cry be started against Italy which, because it drove out freemasonry, " cannot be regarded as a nation."

However, are we not paying too great an honour to freemasonry when we attribute to it the greatest share in the genesis of the League of Nations and in responsibility for its acts? Is not this secret society a society with limited responsibility, not only by reason of its mental weakness, but also because it is, above all else, the instrument of forces more secret still and more to be feared? Is it not unjustly accused of all the sins of Jewry? And if freemasonry is but an instrument, then President Wilson was but the instrument of an instrument.

Amongst the first and the most liberal subscribers towards the propaganda in favour of the League appeared the London bankers. Michelet was doubtless right when he wrote: " It is said that the Jews have no country of their own. They have. It is the London Stock Exchange." That statement is not

quite exact. Just as Great Britain has shared the mastery of the seas with her emancipated daughter, so the republic of the United States has shared with Great Britain the capital of Israel. In this last partition the word mastery must be understood in a different sense. It is passive rather than active, it is submitted to rather than exercised. The mastery of the seas is almost equally divided, but the mastery of Israel is unequally endured. It is more complete in Wall Street than in the City of London. It is the more complete in the United States of America, because it is there the more discreet. It is a force of which it cannot be said, as of the military force in our colonies, according to Lyautey, that it is paraded in order to avoid its employment ; on the contrary, it is a force which is only applied efficaciously on condition that it is not openly paraded. It has ways and means more hidden, more sinuous and surer than public subscriptions. The preponderant part played by the great Jewish bankers in the Russian revolution need not be demonstrated. They let it loose upon the world in conjunction with Germany whence they came and where they had their associates.

When Berlin sent Lenin and Trotsky into Russia in compartments hermetically sealed like tubes of pathogenic culture, the objective was quite clear : it was to corrupt the Russian army by revolution and to carry treason from Brest-Litovsk in order to recall to the French front the sixty German divisions which would thus become available. The objective of international finance in New York is more obscure. To the extent that it was American it betrayed its country of adoption and gave an example of the general antagonism of interests which exists between nations and capital, anonymous and vagabond. As a matter of fact

bolshevism, which is the Russian adaptation of Marxism, that is, the materialist conception of society, proposed to itself, by and on behalf of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to industrialize Russia to the fullest possible extent. In this project it has already partly succeeded. From the economic point of view this meant organizing against the United States of America a most formidable competition. By reason of its immense possibilities, its inexhaustible resources in raw materials of every description, the fertility of its soil and the diversity of its climate, the abundance of labour, the plasticity and passivity of its population, and, finally, its position between Europe and Asia, Russia, when once it is equipped, will be the only country able to compete with the United States for the economic lordship of the world. In the match between these two heavyweights the international Finance of the United States will have trained the adversary.

From the political point of view bolshevism, the " colt " of the New York bankers, is no less opposed to American interests. The whole of the diplomacy of the Washington cabinet is dominated by the rivalry of Japan for the control of the Pacific and of China. Hence it is driven to find in Russia the ally on the other side, whom we ourselves looked for against Germany, when Russia and Germany were neighbours. Now, if bolshevism, Americanized or Germanized in mechanical technique, is capable of developing the economic power of Russia it could only enfeeble its military power and its value as a counterpoise against Japanese expansion. In fact, despite the revival of Slavonic nationalism under the Soviet *régime* and its ultra-militarist nature, it has not been able to maintain the position of Czarist Russia in the Far East where, on the contrary, Japan is advancing with giant

strides. Finally as the social order in the United States, more than in any other country, is based on capitalism, it is impossible that any other sentiment but of horror for a revolution founded on undiluted communism should there exist.

Why are the New York bankers, along with the German General Staff, the responsible authors of the Russian revolution? Are they, then, *a fortiori* the authors of all revolutions, since for them, in the conflict between the interests of their own country and, as it seems, their individual interests on the one side, and the revolution on the other side, it is the revolution which wins? The solidarity of faith which obtains between the New York bankers and the bolshevist leaders and the feelings inspired amongst the Jews by their sufferings in Czarist Russia are not a sufficient explanation of this paradox.

The paradox is not a mystery. If it is to be regarded as a mystery, the key comes to us of its own accord, even when the guardians of the temple do not surrender it. I met one of them at Budapest in 1919, a few days after the fall of Bela-Kuhn, driven out by the Roumanian army. The capital of Hungary, being an excellent base for the conquest of Central Europe by the bolshevists, had become their General Headquarters. A few of the most eminent stategists of the revolution had installed themselves in Budapest under cover of commercial, financial and even humanitarian missions. Misery and famine were then ravaging all the Danubian countries. The majority of these bolshevists had remained at their posts after the occupation of the town by the Roumanians. To avoid protests from the Supreme Council which was then in session in Paris, the liberators of Hungary had not expelled these strategists of the revolution. In this affair all the

thunders of the Council were reserved, not for the bolshevists, but for the Roumanian gendarmerie who by suppressing this centre of bloody anarchy had saved, in spite of itself, Western Civilization in that part of Europe. In the following year Poland was to save Western Civilization, a second time in spite of itself, by driving back the Soviet hordes. The pressure exerted on Roumania, first to prevent her from occupying Hungary, then to compel her to evacuate it before Hungary's complete restoration to health, in case she refused to obey the Supreme Council, went as far as a threat to regard as null and void the undertakings of the allies, subject to which Roumania had entered the war against the central powers. General Smuts, the delegate from South Africa on the Supreme Council, was even charged with a special mission to Bela-Kuhn, who, though an enemy of the allied nations, cut a figure as the ally of their governments against another allied nation. Let us observe that if the League had as yet no official existence—it was the treaty of Versailles which was to be its birth certificate—it was already obligingly constituted for this occasion and was functioning secretly. It was even then trying out its powers against Roumania and in favour of bolshevism, in the manner of 1920 in face of the Soviet attack on Poland. In both crises the inspiration came from the same source. In 1919 President Wilson, the master of the Supreme Council, the godfather and the father, at any rate by adoption, of the League of Nations, forced upon the Supreme Council that scandalous partiality in favour of bolshevism. In 1920, even if Wilson had quitted the political scene, the same hidden powers of which he was the instrument still protected the Soviets.

This situation explains how the masked allies of

Bela-Kuhn had remained at Budapest after his defeat and how it was possible to meet them at the tables of the allied missions of which some of them were members. This fact was very convenient for them and enabled them to accomplish their other mission. They drank Tokay with as much gusto at allied tables as at the table of Bela-Kuhn, and when they had drunk more Tokay than the children who were their official protégés had drunk of milk, their tongues were loosened. A number of Jewish revolutionaries who had been expelled from Hungary were there after the Armistice. They wore American uniforms. Their reports to Wilson inspired the policy of the Supreme Council in Central Europe. I have retained in my memory the conversation of one of these augurs whose table neighbour I was at one of those international dinners which are the best school but the most dangerous reef for diplomacy. He had become a director of a great New York bank, one of those which were financing the bolshevist revolution. He was not, however, " fixed to the ground like a strong box," as Louis Philippe said of Casimir Périer. On the contrary, he had intelligence in his speciality and a readiness to make any effort to reach higher regions. Like a good Oriental his speech was couched in imagery to which his active mind gave an intellectual development. A fellow guest had asked him how it was possible for high finance to protect bolshevism, a system hostile to that movable property whose existence is necessary for the banking industry, and also to those riches which are represented by land and buildings, not less a necessity for banking. Our friend who was then at the head of a mission for feeding those who were without bread, swigged off a big glass of Tokay, paused for a moment, taking a long pull at

his enormous cigar which had cost five golden francs and then said :

" Those who are astonished at our alliance with the Soviets forget that the nation of Israel is the most nationalist of all peoples, for it is the most ancient, the most united and the most exclusive. They forget that its nationalism is the most heroic because it has resisted the most terrible persecutions. They forget that it is also the purest nationalism, since it is the most spiritual ; it has existed through the centuries in spite of all obstacles without any territory to give it strength. Like the papacy, it is œcumenical and spiritual. But its eyes are turned towards the future rather than the past and its kingdom is of this world.

" That is why it is the salt of the earth, yet it is, as they say on the boulevards, *le plus dessalé* of nationalisms, which means that the world decants it and despoils it."

As a few of the guests received the last statement with an irrepressible smile, the sage of Sion replied with this comment : " When I say ' despoils,' I mean that the wine of our nationalism is the most drinkable in the world ; it has the finest bouquet, and the nations of the world absorb it with the greatest ease, with delight and without a headache in the morning. But, to return to the subject of salt, do you know the saying of the men who salt cod fish ? I picked it up on the fishing grounds of Newfoundland. Here it is : ' Too much salt corrodes meat, too little lets it rot.' The precept can with justice be applied both to the human mind and to the peoples of the earth. We, Jews, apply it wisely as it should be applied, salt being the emblem of wisdom. We mingle it discreetly with the bread that men consume. We administer it in corrosive doses only in exceptional

cases, when it is necessary to get rid of the *débris* of an immoral past, as in the case of Czarist Russia. That gives you a partial explanation why bolshevism finds favour in our eyes; it is an admirable salting tub in which to corrode and destroy and not to preserve. But beyond and above this particular instance we are in communion with Marxism in its purest form in the International, in other words with our religion, because it is the weapon of our nationalism, in turn defensive and offensive, buckler and sword. You will say that Marxism is the very antithesis of capitalism which is equally sacred to us. It is precisely for the reason that they are direct opposites to one another, that they put into our hands the two poles of this planet and allow us to be its axis. These two contraries, like bolshevism and ourselves, find their identity in the International. These opposites which are at the antipodes to one another in society and in their doctrines meet again in the identity of their purpose and end, the remaking of the world from above by the control of riches, and from below by revolution. For centuries Israel has been segregated from Christianity, thrust into the ghetto to exhibit to the faithful what is called the evidence of the ancient law, in a humiliation which they declare to be a punishment for the crime of slaying God. And this fate saved us and, through us, will save humanity. In this way we preserved our genius and our divine mission. To-day it is we who are the true faithful. Our mission consists in promulgating the new law and in creating a God, that is to say in purifying the idea of God and realizing it when the time shall come. We shall purify that idea by identifying it with the notion of Israel, which has become its own Messiah. The advent of it will be facilitated by the final triumph of Israel. In these

ideas we find our New Testament in which we reconcile kings and prophets, as David the prophet-king and the king-prophet united them in his own person. We are kings that the prophecies may be fulfilled, and we are prophets that we may not cease to be kings."

Then the " king-prophet " drank another glass of Tokay. A sceptic raised this objection: " Don't you risk being the martyrs of this Messiah whose prophets and apostles you are? For though your nationalism may be despoiled, it also sometimes despoils other nations. If you despise riches you do not disdain them altogether, as a means not of enjoyment but power. How is it possible for the triumph of the Universal Revolution, the destroyer and denier of capitalism, to prepare the triumph of Israel which is the sacred ark of this same capitalism? "

" I am not ignorant of the fact that Jeroboam spread the cult of the Golden Calf from Dan to Bethel, and that Revolution is, in our days, the chief priestess of this cult and the most diligent provider of its tabernacles. If the Golden Calf is still standing, its most comfortable pedestal is undoubtedly the tomb of empires. In the first place revolution is never anything but the displacement of privileges which arise from wealth. It is not the creation of riches, nor even their exploitation which feeds the Golden Calf, it is above all else the mobilization of wealth, the soul of speculation, which feeds it. The more frequently wealth changes hands, the more of it remains in our hands. We are the brokers who receive commissions on all exchanges, or, if you prefer the expression, we are toll-gatherers who control the crossways of the world and collect a tax on all movements of that wealth which is ' anonymous and vagabond,' whether such movements are from country to country, or are

the oscillations of market prices. To the calm and monotonous song of prosperity we prefer the passionate voices, raised in turn, of a rise and fall in market values. There is nothing like a revolution to excite them, unless it is a war which is also a revolution. Then again revolution enfeebles nations and puts them in a condition in which they can least resist foreign enterprises. The health of our Golden Calf calls for the sickness of certain nations, those which are incapable of developing themselves by their own efforts. On the contrary we are in close association with the great modern states such as France, England, the United States, Italy, etc., who are represented at this table. They have entertained us with generous hospitality and with them we are collaborating for the progress of civilization. On the other hand, let us take, for example, Turkey before the war, 'the sick man of Europe,' as the diplomats used to say. This 'sick man' was necessary to our health for he showered upon us concessions of all kinds : banks, mines, ports, railways, etc. The whole economic life of Turkey was entrusted to us. We looked after him so well, that he died of the treatment, at least as far as Turkey in Europe was concerned. Looking at things from the vulgar point of view of the accumulation of wealth for the purpose of accomplishing our mission, we wanted another 'sick man.' That need would by itself have been a sufficient reason, beyond all higher considerations, for inoculating pre-war Russia with bolshevism. Russia is now the sick man of post-war times, much more nutritive to us than the Ottoman Empire and much less able to defend itself. Russia is our new feast. It will soon be a corpse and our only trouble will be to carve it up."

At the other end of the table sat a co-religionist. He

was the *enfant terrible* of the synagogue and had waited for the psychological moment to get in his word. He cried out : " They take us for birds of prey, we are rather carrion birds."

" Well, yes, if you insist," replied the apologist for the new faith, " but please add that we are carrion birds for the good of humanity, for its moral health, just as in countries where sanitation and hygiene are in a rudimentary condition there are other carrion birds for the physical health of the public. Add also that our essential dynamism makes use of the forces of destruction and the forces of creation, but uses the first to nourish the second. What indeed were countries like pre-war Turkey, pre-war Russia and even pre-war Hungary with its feudal *régime* and its latifundia ? They were paralysed limbs which spoilt all movements of the world. They were rather clots of blood in the circulation of Europe which might bring about its death by obliterating its vital blood vessels. By dissolving them we restore them to the current of blood circulating through the whole body. If, in the course of the operation, a few drops of this liquefied blood are scattered, why should we disturb ourselves ? It is a paltry price for an immense benefit. One of our countrymen has said that we, as a people, are an organized majority. Another has said that we are revolutionaries because we are conservers of ourselves. In the management of the new world we give proof of our organization both for revolution and for conservation. Our organization for revolution is evidenced by destructive bolshevism and for construction by the creation of the League of Nations which is also our work. Bolshevism is the accelerator and the League is the brake on the mechanism of which we supply both the motive

force and the guiding power. What is the end? It is already determined by our mission. Israel is a synthetic and homogeneous nation. It is formed of elements scattered throughout the whole world, but cast in the flame of our faith in ourselves. We are a League of Nations which contains the elements of all others. It is this fact which qualifies us to unite the nations around us. We are accused of being the agent which dissolves them. It is only at points which are impervious to that synthesis of national elements, of which ours is both the example and the means, that we act as a dissolvent. We do not break the surface except to awaken in the depths below the affinities which do not yet recognize each other. We are not the greatest common divisor of the nations except to become their greatest common federator. Israel is the microcosm and the germ of the City of the Future."

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS WHICH WAS HATCHED OUT IN PETROGRAD WAS CONCEIVED IN BERLIN

As I was going back to my hotel along the Danube, accompanied by the sceptical guest, he said to me: "Did this prophet lie because, being under the sway of contradictory obligations towards his co-religionists and the allies, he was between two stools, or did he speak the truth, because he had drunk a few glasses of wine and was a bit intoxicated? Probably there was a little of both. On certain points his language conformed too closely to that used by the other prophets not to reflect their actual thought. Did not Karl Marx glorify both war and revolution as the midwives of societies? Was it not Lassalle who wanted the workers to be taught their own wretchedness? And is not the best manner of teaching them to reduce them

to a condition of misery? And is not a revolution which is aimed at the decomposition of a nation quicker and more complete if all classes are made wretched, if they are handed over to Chinese torturers as in Russia, or to Bela-Kuhn as in Hungary? His gastronomic metaphors, with reference to the preparation of the nations by revolution to make them exactly fit for consumption, remind us of the beetles used by cooks to mortify (such is the technical term) meat which is too fresh, in order to make it tender for the table. Have you ever noticed that when these peoples speak of 'advanced countries' they do so in terms of horrible greediness which suggest the kitchen and a delectable odour of game? No doubt all is not pure invention in his story of those twin brothers Bolshevism and the League of Nations, moving in the heart of international High Finance at New York, which destines one of them to overturn the world and the other to regenerate it. What is your opinion?"

I had no opinion to offer. Since then, however, I have often thought about it. I think of it to-day as I read the list of the 200 families who as a body represent the industrial power of France, the national portion of the wall of money, the economic bastion in the rampart of the city, whatever may be the misdeeds of certain of its members. The names of the carrion eaters, those who are waiting impatiently till France shall be ready for them and who, to speed up her collapse, are financing communism, are not written in this Book of Gold.

The brotherhood of bolshevism and the League of Nations was no novelty for me. However, the only sign of it I knew was so trivial that I should not have remembered it, if it had not derived the first suggestion of confirmation from the conversations *inter pocula* at

force and the guiding power. What is the end? It is already determined by our mission. Israel is a synthetic and homogeneous nation. It is formed of elements scattered throughout the whole world, but cast in the flame of our faith in ourselves. We are a League of Nations which contains the elements of all others. It is this fact which qualifies us to unite the nations around us. We are accused of being the agent which dissolves them. It is only at points which are impervious to that synthesis of national elements, of which ours is both the example and the means, that we act as a dissolvent. We do not break the surface except to awaken in the depths below the affinities which do not yet recognize each other. We are not the greatest common divisor of the nations except to become their greatest common federator. Israel is the microcosm and the germ of the City of the Future."

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS WHICH WAS HATCHED OUT IN PETROGRAD WAS CONCEIVED IN BERLIN

As I was going back to my hotel along the Danube, accompanied by the sceptical guest, he said to me: "Did this prophet lie because, being under the sway of contradictory obligations towards his co-religionists and the allies, he was between two stools, or did he speak the truth, because he had drunk a few glasses of wine and was a bit intoxicated? Probably there was a little of both. On certain points his language conformed too closely to that used by the other prophets not to reflect their actual thought. Did not Karl Marx glorify both war and revolution as the midwives of societies? Was it not Lassalle who wanted the workers to be taught their own wretchedness? And is not the best manner of teaching them to reduce them

to a condition of misery? And is not a revolution which is aimed at the decomposition of a nation quicker and more complete if all classes are made wretched, if they are handed over to Chinese torturers as in Russia, or to Bela-Kuhn as in Hungary? His gastronomic metaphors, with reference to the preparation of the nations by revolution to make them exactly fit for consumption, remind us of the beetles used by cooks to mortify (such is the technical term) meat which is too fresh, in order to make it tender for the table. Have you ever noticed that when these peoples speak of 'advanced countries' they do so in terms of horrible greediness which suggest the kitchen and a delectable odour of game? No doubt all is not pure invention in his story of those twin brothers Bolshevism and the League of Nations, moving in the heart of international High Finance at New York, which destines one of them to overturn the world and the other to regenerate it. What is your opinion?"

I had no opinion to offer. Since then, however, I have often thought about it. I think of it to-day as I read the list of the 200 families who as a body represent the industrial power of France, the national portion of the wall of money, the economic bastion in the rampart of the city, whatever may be the misdeeds of certain of its members. The names of the carrion eaters, those who are waiting impatiently till France shall be ready for them and who, to speed up her collapse, are financing communism, are not written in this Book of Gold.

The brotherhood of bolshevism and the League of Nations was no novelty for me. However, the only sign of it I knew was so trivial that I should not have remembered it, if it had not derived the first suggestion of confirmation from the conversations *inter pocula* at

Budapest. A few months before when the result of the war, still in the balance on the western front, seemed quite desperate on the eastern front, as a result of the Russian revolution, I had received at Jassy a visit from Albert Thomas. There our Roumanian allies were putting up a fierce and energetic resistance against the enemy. Albert Thomas was at that time our representative in the new Russia. The allies, who were blinded to the nature of the Russian revolution by their scholastic memories of the French revolution, had at first saluted it as the dawn of a mass-rising in Russia to defend the fatherland against the invader to the bitter end. They had thought it a clever move to recall their ambassadors who were ill-qualified to speak from a warlike revolutionary platform, and to replace them by socialist leaders. England had sent Mr. Henderson, who tried out his powers in Russia for his future position of chairman of the Disarmament Conference at Geneva by an ardent advocacy of the crusade of democracies against imperialisms. Russia was then the last-born of democracies, and the greatest, fondest hopes were placed in her. M. Vandervelde joined Mr. Henderson in the name of Belgium. Then Albert Thomas was put in charge of the job of getting the Russian " steam-roller " at work again. To-day the " steam-roller " is rolling over France and crushing her. M. Thomas applied himself to the task of getting it to move by breathing into it the spirit of its ancestors. It was through me that he came to Jassy, not certainly to galvanize into action the 500,000 Russians who held, or, rather, were letting go their hold on the Russo-Roumanian front, but to furnish evidence of our sympathy with Roumania. Being on the spot it was impossible for me to entertain any delusions whatever with regard to the

Russians. Roumania was in a tragic situation, a prey to famine and epidemics, completely surrounded by her enemies and betrayed by the only ally with whom she was in contact, yet still she put up an heroic defence of the last little corner of her territory which remained free from the invader. Albert Thomas was the most intelligent and most patriotic of all the men of the extreme left whom I have met. With complete contempt for fatigue and danger he squandered his powers and energies to bring to the troops in the front line a salutation from France. His chief mission was to galvanize into action the Russian army and he took advantage of his stay in Jassy to visit the whole of the Russo-Roumanian front and to spread the good word along it, which he did by making a score of speeches every day to the ears of as many units. I accompanied him on one of his rounds. I admired his zeal, his endurance and his eloquence all the more because this apostle had no belief in the Word, not even in his own. His harangues, or rather his harangue, for it was always the same, was a medley of Karl Marx and Déroulède, a hymn to the revolution and a blast on the bugle. Karl Marx only intervened to make the audience swallow Déroulède, who clearly had the orator's preference. He put into his speeches such heat that at a temperature of 20 degrees below zero the sweat ran down his face in the open air. To this oratorical torrent succeeded a flood of champagne of an execrable German brand, the gift of the German troops opposite. As soon as the first symptoms of the Russian revolution appeared on the front, companies of fraternization had been formed amongst the Germans to accelerate the decomposition of the enemy front. After he had kissed the officers on the mouth and given his benediction to the soldiers he

departed to the accompaniment of frenzied applause. From the luxurious disorder of his hair the Russian soldiers mistook him for a French *papas*. They then deserted *en masse*. He was conscious of the futility of this apostolate, and yet his fervour was not diminished. This made me compare him to the hero of a story by Jules Lemaître, a certain Serenus, who suffered martyrdom for having blasphemed the gods without believing in God. He did this, through dilettantism or stoicism, to please himself. In his torture he cried out, " No, it is not as useless as it seems for I spread the good seed." M. Thomas said, " I do not deceive myself as to the merits of my eloquence, nor do I waste my powers for these moujiks. The greater part of my speech, the whole paraphrase from Karl Marx, except the adaptation, more or less made up for the circumstances, of the holy war and ' in the name of social justice against capitalistic militarism,' I served up to the Russians in the same terms as I did to my socialist audiences at Belleville and Menilmontant.

It is a curious and, at the same time, a humiliating thing for orators that the Russian soldiers, who did not understand a word of what I told them, the translation being made only *en bloc* after the speech, applauded exactly in the same places as their Parisian comrades. In an oration there is in the action, the gesture, the look, something which commands applause, independently of the sense of the words. Eloquence is physical, not intellectual. But did you notice that the only passage which inspired enthusiasm when the interpretator translated it was the one I had made up especially for them, the speech on the future League of Nations ? " The laughing, even mischievous, eyes of Albert Thomas became suddenly mystical when he pronounced that holy name. There only, said he, was an

ideal which was worth living, and even dying for. And he had been recommended at Moscow to hoist this Labarum—*in hoc signo vinces*—in front of Russian troops to stir them up by the mirage of a future, worthy of all sacrifices, the perpetual peace of the nations reconciled in justice. Albert Thomas was not wrong in placing his confidence in the future League of Nations. When next year he was summoned, not to die heroically for the League, but to live comfortably for it, I understood his zeal. His position as director of the International Bureau of Geneva crowned his paradoxical destiny to his heart's desire. Like every good socialist demagogue, he had hurled anathemas at war in his election meetings, but he had preached war to the bitter end on the Russian front. He had branded (with infamy) cannon merchants and demanded in his confessions of faith the suppression of the " budgets of death " to the profit of budgets of life. Yet after entering the government as Under Secretary of State for artillery, he had become all-powerful as Minister for Munitions and had, in a few months, spent with the cannon merchants more millions than they had pocketed in several centuries ; finally he had aroused the indignation of crowds against perquisites and pickings, but he became a beneficiary of the biggest distributor of stipends in Europe. But I am wrong in attributing to this fact his faith in Geneva. I make honourable amends to his memory for there was something else.

Those who look for the truth elsewhere than in official documents know that President Wilson, whose election had been financed by the Great Bank of New York, rendered almost complete obedience to its beck and call. They know the famous telegram, or rather the telegram which was destined to be

famous, addressed on May 28th, 1919, from New York to Mr. Wilson by Jacob Schiff to dictate to him concessions for Germany on the five following points: *régime* of reparations, Upper Silesia, Sarre, Dantzig and Fiume. Up to the receipt of this telegram Mr. Wilson had vigorously supported Clemenceau's point of view, but he at once changed his attitude in order to conform to the word of command from the Association for the League of Free Nations, directed by Jacob H. Schiff and five other American financiers, an association in the name of which the cablegram was sent. His change of direction having determined a majority against France, the treaty of Versailles on these five grave questions was dictated by Jacob H. Schiff and his co-religionists.

But it was not known to what point those who called themselves the masters of the hour and of the future were servile masters. It was not known that the gospel of the new age, the historic message of which the treaty of Versailles is only the expression in form, the note of January 14th, 1918, on the fourteen points, was a *diktat*. It was known only that the fourteenth point, the most important and the corner-stone of the whole edifice, provided for the establishment of the League of Nations. An eminent American journalist, Mr. Morton Fullerton, a friend of France, as foreseeing as he is well-informed, has recently admitted in the *Figaro* (of March 23rd to April 20th, 1936) the uncontrovertible proof. He tells us, with documents in support, that on January 3rd, 1918, a certain M. Sisson, representing in Petrograd the Committee of Public Information (one of those organizations which are the screen of occult powers and have more authority than the official powers), addressed to President Wilson a telegram inviting him immediately to make

a solemn declaration with regard to the conditions of a democratic peace, in terms calculated to facilitate propaganda in Russia in Germany. "I can," said M. Sisson, "fill Germany with German translations and make the widest use of the Russian translation in the army and everywhere." "Five days later in Europe," says Mr. Fullerton, "a shiver of joy was felt, even in the trenches where they were fighting, and the words so dictated fell upon Europe like manna from Heaven. Nobody, or rather few of us, knew that this manna was poisoned." On January 13th M. Sisson cabled to Washington that the walls of Petrograd where the Soviets had received the earliest communication of Wilson's idea and message were covered with it. He added that in Moscow the same publicity would be given to it; that millions of copies would be distributed on the Russian front and on the German front. A few weeks afterwards came the treason of Brest-Litovsk, then the massacre of the Imperial Family at Ekaterinenburg, then . . .

Thus did President Wilson promulgate the new charter of international law so as to be agreeable to the Soviets, who at the same time were applying it in their own fashion by the arrest and imprisonment in the fortress of Peter and Paul of the Minister for Roumania, M. Diamandy, by the pillage of his archives; by the official burglary of the Italian embassy; by the assassination of the gallant Captain Cromy in the British embassy, and finally by the imprisonment of our compatriots amongst whom were M. Mazon, a professor at the College of France and the chief of the French colony, the heroic Pierre Darcy, who lost his life soon afterwards as a martyr to the Cheka.

In the reconstruction of the skeleton of this monster

Mr. Morton Fullerton's discovery is similar in importance to the discovery of one of those two cervical vertebræ supporting the head which, according to Cuvier's law, are described as typical of an organism. At the pace at which things are developing to-day the monster will soon seem prehistoric. I possess of it only a few little broken bones, in the corroborative remarks of the prophet of Budapest and of Albert Thomas to which at the time I heard them I attached no importance whatsoever. Without abandoning himself to hazardous inductions the learned creator of the science of paleontology would no doubt be able to reconstruct from such tiny fragments the whole monster and to insert therein in their proper positions the organically related organs of the revolution and the plutocracy. I will not take upon myself to apply to this example of an unknown species his two fundamental laws: the law of the subordination of organs by virtue of which some have a sovereign influence over the whole of the others, and the law of the correlation of forms by which certain characteristics exist together and are interdependent, whilst others of necessity exclude one another. I restrict myself to suggesting these analogies, whilst I leave to those more learned than myself, especially to the numerous professors of the League of Nations whose knowledge is greater than mine, the duty of making a precise presentation.

I leave to them also the task of establishing the hierarchy of the organs in their subordination to one another. Was the *rôle* of dictator assumed by the Revolution, by the Soviets who must have taken the initiative in the invitation addressed to President Wilson by M. Sisson? Or rather, as I am inclined to think, was not this invitation called for by the

plutocracy of New York, the financiers of the revolution who could refuse it nothing? The plutocracy had taken the full measure of the President. His reason, which was to founder in megalomania, was, without a doubt, already weakening. They could push him in the direction towards which he leaned by that cablegram, dated from Petrograd rather than from anywhere else, to conjure him in the names of the Russian and German peoples to be the arbiter of peace and the saviour of the world. Perhaps the surest means of communication between American finance and the White House passed through Russia. On the other hand, the brusque telegram, already mentioned, sent by Jacob H. Schiff, proves that the germanophiles of New York knew how to get at Mr. Wilson, without having recourse to this indirect fire.

Some readers will be astonished at meeting Germany and Russia associated in the same request to President Wilson and in the enthusiasm aroused by his fourteen points. The League of Nations, according to the fourteenth point, had for its object the provision of mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity for small and great states alike. Did it not therefore raise an insurmountable barrier across the road of German revenge? And how is one to explain the initiative, spontaneous or otherwise, of the Soviets who, whilst they made a pretence of continuing the struggle so as to put the Allies off the scent, already took their orders from Berlin? Would not the whole of this story be under suspicion through its improbability, if the revelation made by Morton Fullerton, far from being contradicted, or even questioned, had not been confirmed by additional evidence? Not the least bit in the world, for the intervention of Germany would provide further

confirmation, if it were necessary. The League of Nations was conceived at Berlin before it was hatched out at Petrograd. We learn this fact from Bülow, who relates that in 1917 he wrote to a high official of the Wilhelmstrasse, saying to him that "without a doubt in those days of extreme crisis he no longer found a minute for rest." Here is his correspondent's reply :—

"It is true that we have much to do ; we are busy elaborating German proposals for the League of Nations which, it is to be hoped, will be the best fruit of the war."

Germany, destined a few years later to take the initiative at Locarno, "the fruit of Geneva," was already planting, whilst the war was still being fought, the spurious olive tree which was to produce Locarno. She was putting into practice the famous maxim of Clausewitz on the identity of war and politics, war being politics and politics being war, each continued and carried on by the other. This identity brings us back to Berlin, our point of departure in this circular trip around war and peace. It is at Berlin that the ring is completed, after having traversed Washington, Paris, London, Budapest and Petrograd. It is also a journey in search of a paternity, the paternity of the League of Nations. The mutual affinities of its ancestry—plutocracy, revolution, freemasonry and pan-germanism—are so close, these affiliations are so consanguineous and convergent, that it may be wondered whether they are distinct one from another and if there is not beneath them all another identity. Idealism, the blind idealism which watched over the cradle of the League, is clearly not one of its fathers. Idealism was there only to provide an alibi for them, to acknowledge their child, to confer upon it the civil status and connections which would help it to make its

way brilliantly in the world. The real fathers disown it in the interests of its career, but in vain. The child gives them the lie, not intentionally, but by its likeness to them which becomes more and more striking as it grows up and by evincing for them a solicitude which would be inexplicable if it were not filial.